

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Evaluation Committee

Faculty Senate

11-16-2015

Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, November 16, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, November 16, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Evaluation Committee*. Paper 27.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval/27

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Evaluation Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
16 November 2015, 12:00-1:30pm (DE 012)**

Present:

Nathan Washburn (Business)
Raymond Veon (Caine College of the Arts)
Mary Conner (Natural Resources)
Tom Lachmar (Science, Chair)
Dory Cochran (Libraries)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Thomas Buttars (USU/SA Executive Vice President)
Ashley Waddoups (USU/SA Student Advocate)
Ty Aller (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)

Absent:

Clay Isom (Agriculture and Applied Sciences)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities and Social Science)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Curtis Dyreson (Engineering)
Jeff Banks (Extension)
Scott Allred (Regional Campuses)

Activities:

- 1) Approved October 2015 minutes.
- 2) Decided to change the name of the Undergraduate Advisor of the Year award to the Undergraduate Mentor of the Year award.
- 3) Discussed the IDEA evaluation instrument and possible recommendations for improving its use with Michael Torrens. He answered questions posed by the committee members present related to possible improvements of the instrument based on the survey of teaching faculty and department heads conducted last semester. He also provided information about the instrument of which the committee members in attendance were not previously aware. The salient points are summarized below:
 - a. Questions can only be added to the IDEA evaluations; existing questions cannot be changed or eliminated.
 - b. While it is possible to conduct the evaluations using hard copy (paper) forms rather than the current on-line method, the two methods cannot be combined. In other words, the evaluations would have to be conducted exclusively either in class using paper forms or on-line. If paper forms are used exclusively, then the evaluations would have to be administered by each individual department.
 - c. The response time window for the IDEA student evaluations can be customized by individual departments. In other words, the time period during which students may complete the evaluations can be determined individually by each department. Furthermore, departments can switch off the e-mail reminders that students have complained about. Finally, it is possible to create a class assignment in Canvas for the students to complete the evaluation.

- d. The applicability of the IDEA evaluation instrument to technical courses is admittedly limited. It was suggested that such classes should develop and adopt a different and more appropriate instrument.
- e. In order to produce meaningful statistical results, the recommended threshold number of students in a class using the IDEA evaluation instrument is five.
- f. With respect to the concern that the IDEA student evaluations may be weighted too heavily by department heads in evaluating the quality of teaching by individual faculty members, the committee members were informed that the recommendation is to weigh it between 30% and 50%.
- g. With respect to the concern that untenured faculty do not receive any useful information for improving their teaching from the results of the IDEA student evaluations, it was suggested that such faculty use the long form rather than the more commonly used short form.

4)

The committee discussed what recommendations related to the future use of the IDEA evaluation instrument it should make to the Faculty Senate. The following were proposed:

- a. The IDEA evaluations appear to be most effectively implemented at the department level. Consequently, the committee recommends that department heads be more intimately involved and pro-active in implementing them.
- b. The evaluations should continue to be conducted using the current on-line method. However, departments should consider customizing response time windows individually, switching off the e-mail reminders, and/or creating class assignments in Canvas for students to complete the evaluations.
- c. Individual departments that offer technical courses should consider developing and adopting a customized evaluation instrument that is more appropriate for evaluating their faculty.
- d. The IDEA evaluations should not be conducted for courses with too few students enrolled in them. Not only are the data not statistically meaningful, but it is difficult to preserve anonymity in such classes. The recommended threshold number of students in a class is five.
- e. Department heads should be reminded to weigh the IDEA student evaluations between 30% and 50% when evaluating the quality of teaching by individual faculty members.
- f. Untenured faculty should be encouraged to use the long form if they wish to receive information that may be useful in improving their teaching.
- g. Finally, the members of the FEC are of the opinion that the IDEA evaluations are more valuable in assessing departments and/or programs as a whole rather than individual faculty members. If there are consistent comments for improving multiple courses taught by various faculty members, then it is recommended that the department head or program manager implement measures for making such improvements.